



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,572	09/30/2003	Stuart D. Cheshire	APL-P3153	7890
63096 7590 11/18/2008 PVF -- APPLE INC. c/o PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP 2820 FIFTH STREET DAVIS, CA 95618-7759				
EXAMINER				
HAMZA, FARUK				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2455				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/676,572

Applicant(s)

CHESHIRE, STUART D.

Examiner

FARUK HAMZA

Art Unit

2455

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-9,11,13-17,19 and 21-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-9,11,13-17,19 and 21-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 September 2008 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-849)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on September 08, 2008. Claims 1, 9, 17 have been amended. Claims 2, 4, 10, 12, 18, 20 and 25-34 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19 and 21-24 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traversat et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0184357) and further in view of Copeland et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0073630) hereinafter referred as Copeland.

Traversat teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a system and method for providing rendezvous nodes in a peer-to-peer networking environment. Rendezvous nodes preferably cache information about network resources that may be useful to peer nodes on a peer-to-peer network (abstract).

As to claim 1, Traversat teaches a method for validating a resource record in a local cache at a client computer system within a network, comprising:

retrieving the resource record from the local cache at the client (abstract, P[0027-0028], P[0295-0295], P[0300-0303], P[0315-0319]);

issuing one or more queries for the resource record (abstract, P[0027-0028],P[0295-0295],P[0300-0303],P[0315-0319]);

waiting for a response to the query (abstract, P[0027-0028],P[0295-0295],P[0300-0303],P[0315-0319]); and

if the response to the query is not received in a pre-determined amount of time, invalidating the resource record at the client (abstract, P[0027-0028],P[0295-0295],P[0300-0303],P[0315-0319]),

Traversat does not explicitly teach the claim limitation of invalidating the resource record comprises invalidating a child resource record of the resource record.

However, Copeland teaches the claim limitation of invalidating the resource record comprises invalidating a child resource record of the resource record ([0033]).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Traversat by adding functionality for invalidating a child resource record of the resource record, which would improve responsiveness of the system. One would be motivated to do such to enhance system's performance.

As to claim 3, Traversat teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:
receiving a multicast message from a second client querying a second device (P[0295-0295],P[0300-0303],P[0315-0319]);

locating a second resource record associated with the second device
(P[0295-0295],P[0300-0303],P[0315-0319]);

waiting for a multicast response to the multicast query (P[0295-
0295],P[0300-0303],P[0315-0319]); and

if after a pre-determined number of queries the multicast response to the
multicast query is not received in the pre-determined amount of time, invalidating
the second resource record (P[0295-0295],P[0300-0303],P[0315-0319]).

As to claim 5, Traversat teaches the method of claim 1, wherein if the
response to the query is not received in a pre-determined amount of time, the
method further comprises:

retrieving a parent record of the resource record at the client, wherein the
parent record refers to the resource record (P[0027-0028],P[0295-0295],P[0300-
0303],P[0315-0319]);

issuing a query for the parent record (P[0027-0028],P[0295-0295],P[0300-
0303],P[0315-0319]);

waiting for a response to the query from the device (P[0027-
0028],P[0295-0295],P[0300-0303],P[0315-0319]); and

if the response to the query is not received in a pre-determined amount of
time, invalidating the parent record, and then repeating the above process by
applying it recursively to any records that refer to the now-invalidated parent
record (P[0027-0028],P[0295-0295],P[0300-0303],P[0315-0319]).

As to claim 6, Traversat teaches the method of claim 1, wherein if the response to the query is not received in a pre-determined amount of time, the method further comprises:

retrieving a parent record of the resource record at the client, wherein the parent record refers to the resource record (P[0027-0028],P[0295-0295],P[0300-0303],P[0315-0319]);

issuing a query for the parent record (P[0027-0028],P[0295-0295],P[0300-0303],P[0315-0319]);

receiving a response to the query from the device, wherein the response includes information for updating the resource record (P[0027-0028],P[0295-0295],P[0300-0303],P[0315-0319]); and

updating the resource record with the information received in the response (P[0027-0028],P[0295-0295],P[0300-0303],P[0315-0319]).

As to claim 7, Traversat teaches the method of claim 6, wherein the method further comprises updating the parent record with the information received in the response (P[0027-0028],P[0295-0295],P[0300-0303],P[0315-0319]).

As to claim 8, Traversat teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the method is invoked at a pre-specified time interval (P[0027-0028],P[0295-0295],P[0300-0303],P[0315-0319]).

Claims 9, 11, 13-17 and 19 and 21-24 do not teach or define any new limitations other than above claims 1, 3 and 5-8. Therefore, claims 9, 11, 13-17 and 19 and 21-24 are rejected for similar reasons.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Faruk Hamza whose telephone number is

571-272-7969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached at 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 886-217-9197 (toll –free).

Faruk Hamza

Patent Examiner

Group Art Unit 2455

/saleh najjar/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2455